

Deborah.Easterling

From: Jocelyn.Boyd
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 9:02 AM
To: Deborah.Easterling
Cc: davido@sunstoresolar.com; pmlgrnlw@yahoo.com; brian.franklin@duke-energy.com; timika.shafeek-horton@duke-energy.com; libbysmith@comcast.net; Edwards, Nanette; Hudson, Shannon; chad.burgess@scana.com; Bholman@selcsc.org; dwilliamson@spilmanlaw.com; sroberts@spilmanlaw.com; davido@sunstoresolar.com
Subject: FW: Don't delay public hearings on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E)

-----Original Message-----

From: Sierra Club [<mailto:information@sierraclub.org>] On Behalf Of Darlene Swope
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 8:18 PM
To: Jocelyn.Boyd
Subject: Don't delay public hearings on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E)

Sep 30, 2013

Jocelyn Boyd
101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100
Columbia, SC 29210

Dear Boyd,

I respectfully disagree with the decision of the Public Service Commission to indefinitely delay the public hearing on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E) that was supposed to have been held this past September 12th, 2013.

While the Energy Advisory Council's work in consideration of net metering issues is important, it is also necessary to continue public discussion and consideration of how existing rules can be improved to allow for clean energy resource competition in our state.

After all, the PSC exists as a public body to best advance its own motto: "a fair, open, and efficient regulatory process that promotes cost-effective and reliable utility services." I hope that the Commission reconsiders streamlining its hosting of an open public discussion about net metering, in order to so carry-out its own vital role as a public service entity. Thank you for your consideration of this request to re-set a date to have this public discussion in the near future.

Sincerely,

Ms. Darlene Swope
2160 Pine St Lot 7
West Columbia, SC 29170-1453
(910) 277-0515

Nina.Gates

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Darlene Swope <djswope@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 8:18 PM
To: PSC_Commissioner.Howard
Subject: Don't delay public hearings on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E)

Sep 30, 2013

John Howard
101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100
Columbia, SC 29210

Dear Howard,

I respectfully disagree with the decision of the Public Service Commission to indefinitely delay the public hearing on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E) that was supposed to have been held this past September 12th, 2013.

While the Energy Advisory Council's work in consideration of net metering issues is important, it is also necessary to continue public discussion and consideration of how existing rules can be improved to allow for clean energy resource competition in our state.

After all, the PSC exists as a public body to best advance its own motto: "a fair, open, and efficient regulatory process that promotes cost-effective and reliable utility services." I hope that the Commission reconsiders streamlining its hosting of an open public discussion about net metering, in order to so carry-out its own vital role as a public service entity. Thank you for your consideration of this request to re-set a date to have this public discussion in the near future.

Sincerely,

Ms. Darlene Swope
2160 Pine St Lot 7
West Columbia, SC 29170-1453
(910) 277-0515

Nina.Gates

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Darlene Swope <djswope@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 8:18 PM
To: PSC_Commissioner.Randall
Subject: Don't delay public hearings on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E)

Sep 30, 2013

Comer Randall
101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100
Columbia, SC 29210

Dear Randall,

I respectfully disagree with the decision of the Public Service Commission to indefinitely delay the public hearing on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E) that was supposed to have been held this past September 12th, 2013.

While the Energy Advisory Council's work in consideration of net metering issues is important, it is also necessary to continue public discussion and consideration of how existing rules can be improved to allow for clean energy resource competition in our state.

After all, the PSC exists as a public body to best advance its own motto: "a fair, open, and efficient regulatory process that promotes cost-effective and reliable utility services." I hope that the Commission reconsiders streamlining its hosting of an open public discussion about net metering, in order to so carry-out its own vital role as a public service entity. Thank you for your consideration of this request to re-set a date to have this public discussion in the near future.

Sincerely,

Ms. Darlene Swope
2160 Pine St Lot 7
West Columbia, SC 29170-1453
(910) 277-0515

Nina.Gates

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Darlene Swope <djswope@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 8:18 PM
To: PSC_Commissioner.Hall
Subject: Don't delay public hearings on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E)

Sep 30, 2013

Nikiya Hall
101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100
Columbia, SC 29210

Dear Hall,

I respectfully disagree with the decision of the Public Service Commission to indefinitely delay the public hearing on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E) that was supposed to have been held this past September 12th, 2013.

While the Energy Advisory Council's work in consideration of net metering issues is important, it is also necessary to continue public discussion and consideration of how existing rules can be improved to allow for clean energy resource competition in our state.

After all, the PSC exists as a public body to best advance its own motto: "a fair, open, and efficient regulatory process that promotes cost-effective and reliable utility services." I hope that the Commission reconsiders streamlining its hosting of an open public discussion about net metering, in order to so carry-out its own vital role as a public service entity. Thank you for your consideration of this request to re-set a date to have this public discussion in the near future.

Sincerely,

Ms. Darlene Swope
2160 Pine St Lot 7
West Columbia, SC 29170-1453
(910) 277-0515

Nina.Gates

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Darlene Swope
<djswope@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 8:18 PM
To: PSC_Commissioner.Whitfield
Subject: Don't delay public hearings on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E)

Sep 30, 2013

Swain Whitfield
101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100
Columbia, SC 29210

Dear Whitfield,

I respectfully disagree with the decision of the Public Service Commission to indefinitely delay the public hearing on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E) that was supposed to have been held this past September 12th, 2013.

While the Energy Advisory Council's work in consideration of net metering issues is important, it is also necessary to continue public discussion and consideration of how existing rules can be improved to allow for clean energy resource competition in our state.

After all, the PSC exists as a public body to best advance its own motto: "a fair, open, and efficient regulatory process that promotes cost-effective and reliable utility services." I hope that the Commission reconsiders streamlining its hosting of an open public discussion about net metering, in order to so carry-out its own vital role as a public service entity. Thank you for your consideration of this request to re-set a date to have this public discussion in the near future.

Sincerely,

Ms. Darlene Swope
2160 Pine St Lot 7
West Columbia, SC 29170-1453
(910) 277-0515

Nina.Gates

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Darlene Swope <djswope@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 8:18 PM
To: PSC_Commissioner.Hamilton
Subject: Don't delay public hearings on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E)

Sep 30, 2013

G. O'Neal Hamilton
101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100
Columbia, SC 29210

Dear Hamilton,

I respectfully disagree with the decision of the Public Service Commission to indefinitely delay the public hearing on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E) that was supposed to have been held this past September 12th, 2013.

While the Energy Advisory Council's work in consideration of net metering issues is important, it is also necessary to continue public discussion and consideration of how existing rules can be improved to allow for clean energy resource competition in our state.

After all, the PSC exists as a public body to best advance its own motto: "a fair, open, and efficient regulatory process that promotes cost-effective and reliable utility services." I hope that the Commission reconsiders streamlining its hosting of an open public discussion about net metering, in order to so carry-out its own vital role as a public service entity. Thank you for your consideration of this request to re-set a date to have this public discussion in the near future.

Sincerely,

Ms. Darlene Swope
2160 Pine St Lot 7
West Columbia, SC 29170-1453
(910) 277-0515

Nina.Gates

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Darlene Swope <djswope@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 30, 2013 8:18 PM
To: PSC_Commissioner.Fleming
Subject: Don't delay public hearings on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E)

Sep 30, 2013

Elizabeth Fleming
101 Executive Center Drive, Suite 100
Columbia, SC 29210

Dear Fleming,

I respectfully disagree with the decision of the Public Service Commission to indefinitely delay the public hearing on net metering (PSC Docket #2005-385-E) that was supposed to have been held this past September 12th, 2013.

While the Energy Advisory Council's work in consideration of net metering issues is important, it is also necessary to continue public discussion and consideration of how existing rules can be improved to allow for clean energy resource competition in our state.

After all, the PSC exists as a public body to best advance its own motto: "a fair, open, and efficient regulatory process that promotes cost-effective and reliable utility services." I hope that the Commission reconsiders streamlining its hosting of an open public discussion about net metering, in order to so carry-out its own vital role as a public service entity. Thank you for your consideration of this request to re-set a date to have this public discussion in the near future.

Sincerely,

Ms. Darlene Swope
2160 Pine St Lot 7
West Columbia, SC 29170-1453
(910) 277-0515

Nina.Gates

From: Marilyn Jones <Marilyn.Jones@fcc.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 01, 2013 9:09 AM
To: Carmell Weathers; 'Adam Newman'; 'Alfred Lee'; 'Amy Putnam'; 'Ann Berkowitz'; Ann Stevens; 'Beth O'Donnell'; 'Betty Sanders'; 'Bill Mason'; 'Brendan Kasper'; 'Brian Lynott'; 'Carolee Hall'; 'Cary B. Hinton'; 'Cyd Anglin'; 'Daniel Stromsland'; 'David Greenhaus'; 'Don Gray'; 'Dyan Adams'; 'Faith Marcotte'; 'Garth Steele'; 'Gegi Leeger'; 'Gina Perini'; Greg Diamond; 'Greg Rogers'; 'Helen Mickiewicz'; 'Henry G. Hultquist'; 'Hon. Betty Ann Kane'; Oneal.Hamilton; 'Hon. Geoffrey G. Why'; 'Hon. Paul Kjellander'; 'Hon. Swati Dandekar'; Indra Sehdev Chalk; 'James Castagna'; 'Jean-Paul Emard'; 'Jeffrey S. Lanning'; 'Jerome Candelaria'; 'John Manning'; 'John Rose'; 'John T. Ambrosi'; 'Jose Jimenez' (jose.jimenez@cox.com); 'Karen Reidy'; 'Karen Riepenkroger'; 'Kevin Green'; 'Kim Wardle'; 'Laura R. Dalton'; 'Linda Peterman'; 'Lorraine Crecelius'; Lynn Slaby (lynn.slaby@puc.state.oh.us); 'Mario Bertrand'; 'Mary C. Albert'; 'Mary McManus'; 'Mary Retka'; 'Mary Tuten'; 'Matthew Gerst'; 'Michael Altschul'; 'Michael Balch'; 'Michael Shortley'; 'Michele K. Thomas'; Michelle Sclater; Nina.Gates; 'Paula Jordan'; Rebecca Beaton; 'Rosemary Emmer'; Sanford Williams; 'Scott Freiermuth'; 'Shaunna Forshee'; 'Stephen Pastorkovich'; Suzanne Smith; 'Thomas Dixon'; 'Thomas Navin'; 'Thomas Pearson'; 'Thomas Soroka, Jr.'; 'Tiki Gaugler'; 'Tim Decker'; 'Tom Goode'; 'Valerie Cardwell'; 'Wayne Jortner'; 'Wendy Newkirk (PSC'
Cc: Walter Boswell
Subject: RE: NANC slides ...

Council Members:

I am contacting you to provide guidance on the effect of the government shutdown on federal advisory committee activities. Until FCC appropriations are resumed, no FCC-sponsored federal advisory committee meetings can take place. This includes face-to-face meetings, teleconferences, electronic meetings, committee votes through any means, etc. This prohibition covers all meetings, whether of the parent advisory committee or any subcommittees or working groups.

Because FCC liaisons are not permitted to do federal advisory committee work during a shutdown (even if that particular staff member might be able to perform other FCC work under a special exception), federal advisory committee activities of any kind that require agency supervision would be impermissible during a shutdown. Similarly, phone or email contacts with agency staff would be impermissible.

No federal advisory committee travel can occur, even if it is already funded. This includes not only federal staff travel, but travel by committee members, consultants, contractors, etc. using government funds or travel requiring repayment by the government. Incurring any expenses that the government would be obligated to repay would be impermissible.

However, there are some individual activities related to the work of Federal advisory committees that would not be prohibited. Specifically, it would not be impermissible for working group members to work on producing sections of reports by themselves *in draft form* if a shutdown occurs. But members could not represent these reports to be a final product of the working group since that would require the members to meet and vote - - an activity that requires DFO supervision, which would be impermissible during a shutdown. Working group members also could share drafts internally among themselves, again provided that these communications did not constitute a meeting or vote. Similarly, occasional communications by phone or email among members of

the parent advisory committee or working groups would be permissible as long as these communications did not result in an electronic meeting (e.g. phone calls involving a quorum, or online voting, etc.).

Thus, so long as activities would not require FCC supervision or any form of FCC funding (or repayment), as in the examples above, members could proceed with independent work. However, members should not engage in new ventures or projects beyond those already assigned at previous meetings, nor should they seek to finalize reports or recommendations. More generally, members should be careful not to undertake any activities that would ordinarily require approval, oversight or supervision by the DFO or agency liaisons.

Please note that the *Federal Register* will not be publishing notices during a government shutdown, and the FCC will not be maintaining its website.

Thanks,
Marilyn

Marilyn Jones
Attorney - Advisor
Designated Federal Officer - NANC
Federal Communications Commission
Wireline Competition Bureau
445 12th St., SW | Washington, DC 20554
[T] 202.418.2357 | [F] 202.418.1413
www.fcc.gov